



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,864	10/17/2003	Carrie Delcomyn	1080	9573
<div>26749 7590 05/17/2007</div> <div>DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP</div> <div>900 LEE STREET</div> <div>SUITE 600</div> <div>CHARLESTON, WV 25301</div>				
			<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>DELCOTTO, GREGORY R</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>1751</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE</div> <div>05/17/2007</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/687,864	Applicant(s) DELCOMYN ET AL.	
	Examiner Gregory R. Del Cotto	Art Unit 1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed 2/28/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,8,9,11 and 29-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,8,9,11 and 29-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, and 29-52 are pending. Claims 3, 5-7, 10, and 12-28 have been canceled. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 1/30/07 have been entered.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/28/07 has been entered.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

The following objections/rejections set forth in the Office action mailed 12/1/06 have been withdrawn:

None.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent

Art Unit: 1751

granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, and 29-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choy et al (US 6,046,150) in view of McNeil et al (US 5,403,549).

Choy et al teach a liquid cleaning or bleaching composition. See Abstract. Suitable peroxygen sources may be monopersulfates, etc. See column 5, lines 1-40. Surfactants may also be used in the compositions and include ethoxylated phenols containing 8 to 16 carbon atoms and averaging 1.5 to 30 moles of ethylene oxide per mole of alcohol. See column 6, lines 35-69. When the composition is used as a hard surface cleaner, alkaline buffers may be used including alkali metal carbonates. See column 7, lines 45-69. Hard surface cleaners include grout cleaners, bathroom and kitchen cleaners, etc., which may remove mildew, mold, and other typical stains found on such surfaces. Note that, the Examiner asserts that cleaning hard surfaces and removing bacteria, mold, etc. as taught by Choy et al would fall within the scope of decontaminating materials contaminated with biological warfare agents. Furthermore,

solvents may also be used in the compositions and include isopropanol, ketones, etc.
See column 10, lines 5-45.

Additionally, Choy et al teach that in a preferred embodiment of a hard surface cleaner delivery, a dual chambered container/dispenser is preferred. One chamber contained an H₂O₂/MMA solution at an acidic pH. The other chamber contained agents to adjust the pH to the optimum level, namely, an alkaline buffer and optionally, a surfactant. Other agents could be included for improved cleaning performance. The preferred delivery is a trigger sprayer which must blend the two solution/fluids from the two chambers prior to delivering the combined solutions as a spray. This could be accomplished by either a mixing chamber, or by directing two fluid streams to a common target point by means of a diverter or other redirection means. Further, it is common to include in the hard surface cleaners at least one solvent to further enhance cleaning performance and to disperse hydrophobic or poorly soluble materials into the liquid cleaner. See column 11, lines 1-60 and column 13, lines 45-69. Note that, the Examiner asserts that Choy et al clearly suggest dual chamber containers in which one side contains an H₂O₂/MMA solution while the other chamber may include surfactants, colorants, solvents such as a ketone, etc., which would allow the monopersulfate compound and ketone to be mixed in-situ and generate dioxirane. The pH of the composition may range from 0 to 10 depending upon the intended use of the composition. See claim 17.

Choy et al do not teach the use of acetone or a composition containing a monopersulfate compound, a carbonate or bicarbonate, a ketone, a cosolvent, and the

other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

McNeil et al teach a method and a composition for disinfecting matter or materials such as medical instruments, operating rooms, examining tables, walls, windows, floors, solutions, porous substances, and the like contaminated with bacterial, bacterial spores, fungi, or viruses. The composition contains a fluid mixture containing a peroxymonosulfate salt and a carbonyl-containing compound and reaction products thereof. The carbonyl containing compound is particularly selected from the group consisting of acetone, 2-pentanone, 4-hydroxy-4-methyl-2-pentanone, etc. Additionally, surfactants may also be used in the compositions. See column 6, lines 10-25. Additionally, McNeil et al teach that the use of a commercially available buffer does not interfere with the activity of the dioxirane containing reaction product. See column 12, lines 50-69. Also, Example 2 states that mixing caroate with a ketone in the presence of a small amount of buffer yielded no bacterial growth which is desirable. See column 11, lines 45-69.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use acetone in the composition taught by Choy et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because McNeil et al teach the use of acetone in a similar disinfecting, hard surface cleaning composition and further, Choy et al teach the use of ketones as solvents in general.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to decontaminate materials contaminated with viruses by using a

composition containing a monopersulfate compound, a carbonate or bicarbonate, a ketone, a cosolvent and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because the broad teachings of Choy et al in combination with McNeil et al suggest decontaminating materials contaminated with viruses by using a composition containing a monopersulfate compound, a carbonate or bicarbonate, a ketone, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, and 29-52 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8, 10, 12-23, 25-27, 34-36, and 38-43 of copending Application No. 10/693194. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from

each other because claims 8, 10, 12-23, 25-27, 34-36, and 38-43 of 10/693194 encompass the material limitations of the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition containing a monopersulfate compound, a carbonate-type buffer, ketone, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because claims 8, 10, 12-23, 25-27, 34-36, and 38-43 suggest a composition containing a monopersulfate compound, a carbonate-type buffer, ketone, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims. Note that, a dioxirane compound as recited by claims 8, 10, 12-23, 25-27, 34-36, and 38-43 of 10/693194 would suggest a composition containing a persulfate and ketone such as acetone since dioxiranes form from combining a persulfate and ketone such as acetone.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

With respect to Choy et al, Applicant states that the compositions of Choy et al fail suggest or achieve the requisite in situ generation of dioxirane. Furthermore, with respect to Choy et al, Applicant states that solvents such as ketone are disclosed as providing a suitable liquid medium for the inventive N-alkyl ammonium acetonitrile compounds and in the circumstance when both a monopersulfate is selected as a peroxygen source, and ketone is selected as a solvent for the MMA ingredient,

dioxirane, to the extent it is generated at all, is generated immediately and not in-situ as required by the instant claims. In response, note that, as stated above, the Examiner asserts that Choy et al clearly suggest dual chamber containers in which one side contains a bleach/MMA solution while the other chamber may include surfactants, colorants, solvents such as a ketone, etc., which would allow the monopersulfate compound and ketone to be kept in separate containers, be mixed in-situ and generate dioxirane at the site. Each side of the container may contain a liquid carrier such that one side contains water as the carrier and the other contains a mixture of water and a solvent such as ketone.

Additionally, with respect to the rejection of the instant claims under 35 USC 103 using Choy et al in combination with McNeil, Applicant states that McNeil teaches away from the instantly claimed compositions by teaching away from buffers in all but highly acidic formulations. Further, Applicant states that neither reference teaches or suggests the inclusion of the presently requisite carbonic-based buffer in dioxirane-generating compositions. In response, first note that, the instant claims do not require any particular amount of buffer and are open to any amount of buffer. Additionally, the instant claims encompass compositions which do have an acidic pH anywhere between about 5 to 7. Thus, the instant claims encompass compositions which contain a buffer but overall have an acidic pH. Additionally, the Examiner maintains that McNeil et al do teach compositions which contain buffer in combination with acetone and peroxysulfate and yielded no bacterial growth (Example 2 and Example 4) which provides motivation to use a buffer in combination with the acetone and peroxysulfate. Note that, Example

4 states that a commercially available buffer in combination did not interfere with the activity of the dioxirane reaction product. McNeil et al is a secondary reference relied upon for its teaching of acetone in a similar bleaching/disinfecting composition. The Examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art clearly would have been motivated to use acetone in the composition taught by Choy et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because McNeil et al teach the use of acetone in a similar disinfecting, hard surface cleaning composition and further, Choy et al teach the use of ketones as solvents in general.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1751

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Gregory R. Del Cotto
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

GRD
May 13, 2007